

Scott Laderman  
September 26, 2013

- With Professor Ginsberg's coming to campus, I was asked to explore and then present on the extent to which the major themes of his book apply to U of M and UMD
  - like many of us, I have seen the numerous job postings that have gone out that appear to suggest considerable growth in the administrative ranks
  - this piqued my curiosity
  - I pored through all sorts of data to see what I could find
  - before I say more, a quick qualification: data at U of M are frustratingly opaque and sometimes inconsistent or even contradictory
  - trying make sense of the data is a herculean task
    - there are internal campus data
    - there are data reported to the Regents
    - there are data reported to IPEDS, which is the federal government's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System
    - these data do not always match up
- But the available data are quite suggestive
  - what they suggest is that some of what Professor Ginsberg argues in his book and about which he'll speak tonight is in fact applicable to U of M and UMD
  - but not all of it
- We have a relatively new administration on campus now, and this means we have a choice and an opportunity
  - will we continue to move in the direction that Professor Ginsberg is going to describe tonight?
  - or will we go the other way?
- *Wall Street Journal* (December 29, 2012) published report that identified the U of M as a poster child for administrative bloat
  - of 72 "very-high-research" public universities in 2011-2012, *Journal* reported that Twin Cities campus had largest share of employees classified as "executive/administrative and managerial"
    - from 2001 to 2012, according to newspaper, U of M system added over 1000 administrators
    - their ranks grew 37%, more than twice as fast as teaching corps and nearly twice as fast as student body
    - in 2012, 81 people with administrative titles were making over \$200,000/year
      - in 2001, even accounting for inflation, it was 39
  - President Kaler responded (*Star Tribune*, January 5, 2013) that more administrative staff were needed to attend to myriad regulations associated

with the U's growing research funds, to improve the student experience, to manage complex technology

- also said the U of M classifies its employees differently from other universities
  - at same time, Kaler pointed to a bigger problem in why tuition has gone up – rising tuition has prompted much of this concern over bloat – which is the disinvestment by the state in public higher education
    - he's right: with cuts in state funding, public higher ed has essentially been privatized
      - this should concern all of us who see education as a public good
  - but critics said Kaler's response failed to fully account for rise in administrative spending
  - his administration conceded that U could not even identify the number of administrators the U employed and pledged to reduce administrative costs
  - he recently said he would cut \$90 million from administrative spending over next 6 years
- This *WSJ* report followed an earlier public embarrassment
    - *Star Tribune* (February 27, 2012) reported that administrators were paid big bucks on their way out
      - Exhibit A for golden parachutes was the former UMD chancellor (retired in summer of 2010): two-month sabbatical, 15-month “administrative transitional leave,” final deposit to retirement fund, and severance check
        - total for 18 months came to \$535,700, which was more than she earned in the two years prior to her retirement
  - Other retiring or departing UMD administrators in recent years have been given amorphously-defined “special projects” that allowed them to collect another semester or year of pay after they supposedly left
    - one former vice chancellor was given task of rethinking what UMD considers its peer institutions
      - if there were other “projects” he was given, they were not known to faculty with whom I have spoken
    - and a former dean who left his position at end of 2010 amidst criticism of excessive spending was tasked with investigating relationship-building with universities in Turkey
      - this meant not only salary but travel budget
  - Let me say that UMD, when considered against Twin Cities campus, is relatively lean in terms of administrative spending
    - but that “relative” is important
      - it does not necessarily mean we are where we should be

- But before getting into that issue, an acknowledgment is important
  - when I say we have seen departures at UMD from Professor Ginsberg's more national conclusions, here's a really important one
  - if one of Professor Ginsberg's arguments is that the growth of administrators and professional staff in America's universities has precipitated the fall of the faculty, our two top administrators at UMD in fact deserve the faculty's appreciation
  - there was no faculty body within the shared governance system at UMD under our previous chancellor
  - our current chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs backed faculty efforts to create one
    - we now have a Faculty Assembly and will shortly have an elected Faculty Council
  - so as frustrating as we might find some of the trends outlined in Professor Ginsberg's work as they pertain to Minnesota, both fairness and decency dictate that we gratefully acknowledge the important contribution of our top administrators to supporting a greater faculty voice in campus governance
  - the new Faculty Assembly and Council put us on a better footing to ensure that some of the trends identified by Professor Ginsberg don't become a problem at UMD
- So what do the data tell us about UMD?
  - it's not always pretty
- Comparing the campus directories from 1997 and 2012, for instance, one colleague of mine found an increase of 138 new administrative and staff positions during that 15-year period
  - to be sure, comparing campus directories is an imperfect method, and most of the new positions were low-paid (often shamefully so) support staff
    - while there are a number of well-paid administrators and professional staff on this campus, most of the staff are, I would argue, considerably undercompensated, particularly in light of the essential and often thankless work they do
  - but this colleague did find that 21 non-faculty director or assistant director positions existed in 2012 that did not exist in 1997
- More broadly, the U's annual report to the Regents (*University Plan, Performance, and Accountability Report*), using the new terms created to identify types of employees, shows continued administrative growth
  - from 2011 to 2012 there was an increase of 2 "direct academic providers"
    - "direct academic providers" means everyone from faculty to extension educators and teaching assistants
  - but during that same period (2011 to 2012) there was an increase of 9 people in what the U calls "Higher Education Mission Support" (4) and "University Leadership" (5) positions

- What are these new positions?
  - it's not always clear, particularly with the administrative shuffle that has happened at UMD in the last few years
  - but perhaps an example would help
  - in 2012 UMD split its Office of Financial Aid and Registrar into two separate entities, thus moving from one director position to two
    - a few months later, an associate vice chancellor sent out a letter to select individuals on campus – but not all faculty – announcing that five additional jobs were being posted in the new Registrar's office
    - “[T]his is,” she wrote, “the largest staff expansion this campus has seen in a while, and there will be questions and hallway conversation about how this happened”
    - but, she noted in an apparent effort to comfort critics, “I am assuring you that the need exists”
- Maybe she was right – at least I hope so
  - it does seem odd, however, that six more people were needed to do the work that six fewer had been doing a year earlier
  - it also raises questions about how we prioritize our needs at UMD
  - in my department (History), for instance, we have serious gaps in our curriculum that have gone unaddressed for years (true for other departments on campus)
    - in History we have not had a single new faculty position since I began at UMD in 2005
      - indeed, my department had more faculty 50 years ago, when the student population was a fraction of what it is now
    - at the moment, we have no one to teach Latin American or South Asian history, which is, by my rough estimate, about 1/4 of the world's population
    - we also no longer have anyone to teach women's history
      - need I point out that women constitute half of the global population?
- To put this in perspective, a colleague of mine crunched the numbers on the number of UMD faculty, administrators, and staff per full-time equivalent (FTE) student in 2012
  - national average for faculty at 4-year public institutions, according to Center for College Affordability and Productivity, is 8 faculty per 100 FTE students
    - at UMD, according to data drawn from the University of Minnesota Campus Book, there are 5.1 FTE faculty per 100 students
  - national average for administrators and staff at 4-year public institutions is 6 per 100 FTE students
    - at UMD, according to IPEDS data, there are 8.4 full-time administrators and staff per 100 students

- what we see at UMD, in other words, is an underrepresentation of faculty and overrepresentation of administrators and staff
- again, we may not be as bloated as the U of M, but we don't seem to be doing well by national standards
- But bodies are only part of the story
  - the money going to administration is ultimately the most significant statistic
  - the data, I must again caution, can be difficult to decipher
- According to the U of M's 2013 Fiscal Pages, the expenditures for "instruction" at UMD increased roughly \$6.2 million, or 11 percent, from FY 2009 to the proposed budget for FY 2013, which is the last year for which data are available
  - during that same period, the expenditures for "academic support" and "institutional support" – these are mostly administration and professional staff – increased more than \$8 million, or about 16 percent
- Moreover, according to data collected by another of my colleagues using the reported salaries associated with administrative job codes, the percentage increase in salaries going to top administrators has been far higher than that of faculty
  - from 2006 to 2012, the top-level administrators at UMD (i.e., the chancellor, vice chancellors, associate vice chancellors, deans, and associate deans) saw their salaries increase 29%
    - this does not include augmentations
      - it is only base salaries
  - conversely, faculty saw their salaries increase roughly 10% during that same period (2006-2012), which is well below the 16% increase that would have been necessary just to keep up with inflation
    - faculty, like our often underpaid staff, also had to begin paying higher out-of-pocket costs for the University's health plan, and a few years ago new faculty saw the University's contribution to their retirement accounts decrease, creating, in essence, a two-tiered faculty structure
  - so what's the upshot?
    - top-level administrative salaries have increased nearly 3 times more than those of faculty
    - and while faculty salaries have not kept up with inflation – which basically means faculty have taken pay cuts – top-level administrative salaries have grown far above the rate of inflation
- How do we account for this increased money for top administrator salaries?
  - administrators like to justify their pay by citing this nebulous thing called "the market"
    - i.e., we have to pay market salaries to attract the best people
  - but the data suggest that the market seems to work only for administrators, at least if we use our below-market faculty salaries as a guide

- indeed, faculty salaries at UMD are at the bottom end of our peer institutions
  - I should note that our local administration recognizes this problem and has begun trying to address it
  - resistance has come from TC
- we've also see administrators benefit from a peculiar arrangement in which their starting salaries are often higher than the end salary of the person they replaced
- by way of context, when faculty retire at the end of their careers, their salaries are usually returned to their departments to hire a newly-minted, and usually much cheaper, faculty replacement
  - that is, the new faculty member's salary is typically well below that of the retiring senior member
- things work differently for administrators, though
- when our most recent past president left the U of M presidency in 2011, his base salary was \$455,000
  - this does not include other forms of compensation (benefits, retirement, bonuses), nor does it include the riverside University mansion in which he lived or the budgets he enjoyed for entertaining, travel, etc.
  - while this pay may be well below that of many corporate chieftains, and indeed of some other university presidents, the base salary is high enough to raise questions – at least it does in my mind – about what we mean by “public service,” particularly as our University president enjoyed a base salary higher than that of the president of the United States
- but if that past University president left his position at an excessive \$455,000 per year, our current U of M president began his position at the even higher \$610,000 per year
- We have seen evidence of similar trends at UMD
  - according to Human Resources data, our most recent former vice chancellor for academic affairs retired at the end of 2011 after many years in the position with a base salary of approximately \$166,000
    - according to these same data, his replacement began with a base salary of \$220,000
  - our most recent former vice chancellor for student life, according to the salary database maintained by the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, was making \$146,560 when he left the job [though it may in fact have been less – the *Pioneer Press* database lumps together all pay, such as augmentations, summer salary, etc.]
    - his successor began in 2011 with a base salary of \$155,000
      - in fact, in her second year in the position her reported base salary showed a raise of greater than 4% (to \$162,755)
        - faculty that year received 2.5% raises

- finally, our most recent former chancellor retired in 2011 after more than ten years in the position with a base salary of \$233,250
  - according to Human Resources data, our current chancellor began the position with a base salary of \$250,000
    - his base salary the following year was approximately \$258,000, which means he received a raise considerably greater than the 2.5 percent faculty received that same year
  - to be fair, I don't blame the chancellor for this: frankly, I, like many of my colleagues, would gladly accept a larger raise from the president or Regents
    - I wish the TC admin would show us the same generosity as faculty
      - our local administrators recognize how faculty have fared at UMD and have been very supportive
    - the resistance has come from the TC
- The data I've briefly discussed here tonight are, I think, troubling and important, and they raise questions about who we value, and how much, and they speak to concerns on which we undoubtedly should act
  - but I hope we can also think bigger
  - as a campus community – faculty, administrators, staff – we all want to do right by our students
  - we've gotten a raw deal from the state, which for years before the current legislature cut back on the investments it made in its young people, decreasing funding for public higher education, which resulted in higher tuition (and debt) for those wanting to go to college
    - we need to work hard to reverse that trend
  - and at UMD we continue to get a raw deal from the U of M, which is far more bloated than this campus and which has provided us with roughly a third of the operations and maintenance dollars per student contact hour as has been provided to the Twin Cities
  - this is, frankly, outrageous, and it must be reversed
  - if President Kaler intends to cut \$90 million of administrative spending over the next 6 years, a portion of that savings must come to UMD
    - our students desperately need it
  - I hope we can unite around a shared vision to, yes, attend to some of the problems revealed by the available data, but for all of us – faculty, administrators, staff – to fight for our students and our campus and ensure that we have the resources we need to meet our collective obligation to graduate thoughtful, critical, and productive members of our state and our global society